

## **REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claims 1, 2, 4 and 5-10 and leaves claim 3 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-10.

Claim 4 stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. Amendments were made to claim 4 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. Various amendments were made throughout claims 5 and 10 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 5 and 10 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made throughout claims 5 and 10 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Claims 1-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Takano (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0099685); and claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano in view of Yang (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163453). These rejections are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1-10 are not taught or suggested by Takano or Yang whether taken individually or in combination with each other

as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to each of the claims so as to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to an information search method, system and server. The information searching method according to the present invention includes inputting a search inquiry character train, forming a summary word list based on the search inquiry character train, inputting a restricting condition for narrowing down search targets, searching a document database to select documents having similarity with the summary word list and examining adaptability of each selected document to determine whether the document satisfies the restricting condition.

Further, according to the present invention the information search method includes outputting as a search results documents that satisfy the restricting condition among documents selected according to the similarity based on the search performed by the search step.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by Takano or Yang whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

It should be noted that Takano is assigned to the same Assignee as that of the present application and as such should the Examiner remove the 35 USC §102(e) rejection and is of the opinion that the claims may be obvious relative to Takano, attention is directed to 35 USC §103(c). This statute

essentially states that subject matter developed by another which qualifies as prior art only under 35 USC §102(e) shall not preclude patentability where the subject matter and the claimed invention were at the time the claimed invention was made owned by the same entity. Such would be case regarding the rejection of claims 1-8 and 10 is the 35 USC §102(e) rejection is removed and replaced by a rejection under 35 USC §103(a) based on Takano.

It is submitted that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Takano. Takano merely discloses that some databases accept all Boolean expressions, whereas other databases accept only a limited number of Boolean expressions such as AND or OR. Takano teaches that to account of such the usage of each search engine is recorded in the Boolean expression confirmation means 6015 of the search server 601 and a search is sent to a search engine using the simplest form of the query expression acceptable by the particular search engine. Attention is directed to paragraph [0115] of Takano.

Takano teaches that after an associative search or/and key word search, the selected topic words are used as keys for a subsequent search. Attention is directed to paragraph [0114] of Fig. 3 of Takano. Takano discloses that the search server merges the search result of the key word search type databases and associative document search byte databases as set forth in paragraph [0109] – [0111] as illustrated, for example, in Fig. 8.

Thus, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Takano that allows the forming of a summary word list based on the search inquiry

character train and the inputting of a restricting condition for narrowing down search targets as in the present invention. According to the present invention as recited in the claims, searching is conducted in the document database to select documents having similarity with the summary word list and each selected document is examined regarding adaptability so as to determine whether the document satisfies the restricting condition. In the present invention, search results is output identifying documents that satisfy the restricting condition among the documents selected according to the similarity based on the search performed by the search step. These features of the present invention are discussed, for example, on page 47, lines 13-23 of the present application. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Takano.

Thus, Takano fails to teach or suggest inputting a search inquiry character train, forming a summary word list based on the search inquiry character train and inputting a restricting condition for narrowing down search targets as recited in the claims.

Further, Takano fails to teach or suggest searching a document database to select documents having similarity with the summary word list, examining adaptability of each selected document to determine whether the document satisfies the restricting condition and outputting as search results documents that satisfy the restricting condition among documents selected according to the similarity based on the search performed by the search step as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Takano fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly,

reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 1-8 and 10 as being anticipated by Takano is respectfully requested.

The above described deficiencies of Takano are not supplied by Yang. Therefore, combining the teachings of Takano and Yang in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Yang merely teaches the narrowing of the search from search results. However, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Yang of any of the above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims, said features having been shown above not to be taught or suggested by Takano. Thus, combining the teachings of Takano and Yang in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 9 as being unpatentable over Takano in view of Yang is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (ASA-1169).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



---

Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 684-1120